



FEB 05 2004

Image AF 1600

PTO/SB/21 (01-03)

Approval for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/755,016	
	Filing Date	Jan 5, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Walke, D. Wade	
	Art Unit	1652	
	Examiner Name	C. Fronda	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	17	Attorney Docket Number	LEX-0114-USA

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form  <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached  <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply  <input type="checkbox"/> After Final  <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request  <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request  <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement  <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application  <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address  <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer  <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund  <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group  <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)  <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information  <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):  - Return Postcard
Remarks		
<b>FILED IN TRIPLICATE</b>  Customer # 24231		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual	Lexicon Genetics Incorporated  Lance K. Ishimoto Reg. No. 41,866
Signature	<i>Lance K. Ishimoto by David W. Haberer</i> DAVID W. HABERER REG. NO. 41,071
Date	February 4, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail Label # EV 173548201 US in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents, USPTO, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this date: February 4, 2004	
Typed or printed	Michelle Klein
Signature	<i>Michelle Klein</i>
Date	February 4, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Walke *et al.*

Serial No.: 09/755,016

Group Art Unit: 1652

Filed: 01/05/2001

Examiner: C. Fronda

For: Novel Human Proteases and Polynucleotides Attorney Docket No.: LEX-0114-USA  
Encoding the Same

**REPLY BRIEF**

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	1
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	1
III.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS .....	1
IV.	STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS .....	1
V.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION .....	2
VI.	ISSUES ON APPEAL .....	2
VII.	GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS .....	2
VIII.	CLAIMS APPEALED .....	2
IX.	PRIOR ART OF RECORD .....	2
X.	ARGUMENT .....	3-11
A.	Do Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 Lack a Patentable Utility? .....	3-8
B.	Are Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 Unusable Due to a Lack of Patentable Utility? .....	9
C.	Do Claims 1 and 7-10 Meet The Written Description Requirement? .....	9-11
XI.	CONCLUSION .....	12

## **APPEAL BRIEF**

Sir:

Appellants hereby submit an original and two copies of this Reply Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("the Board") in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on December 4, 2003. This Reply Brief is timely submitted, and Appellants believe no fees are due in connection with this Reply Brief. However, should any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 be required for any reason related to this communication, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Lexicon Genetics Incorporated Deposit Account No. 50-0892.

### **I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(a) statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief" (Examiner's Answer at page 1).

### **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

### **III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

### **IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he summary of invention contained in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **VI. ISSUES ON APPEAL**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **VII. GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS**

Appellants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that "Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 2, and 5-10 do not stand or fall together" (Examiner's Answer at page 2). Appellants clearly stated in the Appeal Brief, and reiterate here, that "(f)or the purposes of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, associated with the utility rejection, the claims will stand or fall together. For the purposes of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, associated with written description, claims 1 and 7-10 will stand or fall together."

## **VIII. CLAIMS APPEALED**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **IX. PRIOR ART OF RECORD**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "Attwood et al." and "Ponting" are the only prior art references of record relied on in the currently pending rejections (Examiner's Answer bridging pages 2 and 3).

## X. ARGUMENT

### A. Do Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 Lack a Patentable Utility?

Appellants do not wish to restate all of the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief concerning the Examiner's allegation that claims 1, 2 and 5-10 lack a patentable utility, and instead incorporate the entirety of Section VIII(A) of the Appeal Brief at this point herein by reference. However, Appellants are compelled to specifically address certain arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer for the record.

Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that the present nucleic acid sequences have utility in forensic analysis, as described in the specification as originally filed (see, for example, page 10, lines 13-24). As described in the specification at page 15, lines 22-29, the presently claimed sequence defines three coding single nucleotide polymorphisms - specifically, a C/T polymorphism at nucleotide position 28 of SEQ ID NO:3, a silent polymorphism that results in a leucine at amino acid position 10 of SEQ ID NO:4; a C/T polymorphism at nucleotide position 55 of SEQ ID NO:3, which can result in a tyrosine or histidine at amino acid position 19 of SEQ ID NO:4; and a G/A polymorphism at nucleotide position 379 of SEQ ID NO:3, which can result in an alanine or threonine at amino acid position 127 of SEQ ID NO:4. Appellants pointed out that as such polymorphisms are the basis for forensic analysis, which is undoubtedly a "real world" utility, the presently claimed sequence must in itself be useful.

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states that "forensic analysis can be useful for determining the presence or absence of polymorphisms which (*sic*) have been demonstrated to exist" (the Examiner's Answer at page 7), but then states that the polymorphic markers **identified** and **described** by Appellants in the specification as originally filed are not useful in forensic analysis because "the instant specification only describes **potential** polymorphisms but not actual polymorphisms" (the Examiner's Answer at page 7, emphasis in original). The Examiner appears to believe that the polymorphic markers **identified** and **described** by Appellants in the specification as originally filed are not "actual" polymorphisms because of the use of the word "can" by Appellants: "the specification states on page 15, lines 22-30: 'the described NHP sequences **can** contain a variety of polymorphisms such as at nucleotide 28 of SEQ ID NO:3 and nucleotide 55 of SEQ ID NO:3 which both can be a C or a T and **can** give rise to silent mutation at corresponding amino acid position 10 of SEQ ID NO:4 or a tyr or his at amino acid position 19 of SEQ

ID NO:4. The described NHP sequences can also contain G-A polymorphisms at nucleotide 379 of SEQ ID NO:3 and nucleotide position 199 of SEQ ID NO:5 which **can** give rise to a corresponding ala or thr at amino acid position 127 of SEQ ID NO:4, or residue 67 of SEQ ID NO:6.’ (emphasis added)” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 6, emphasis in original).

First, it should be pointed out that the section of the specification quoted by the Examiner refers to “sequences”, specifically, the claimed SEQ ID NOS:3 and 4. Appellants respectfully point out that nucleotide and amino acid sequences in and of themselves cannot contain a polymorphism - rather, a polymorphism is a representation of a position in a population of nucleotide sequences that exhibits variability within a number of independent isolates of a given sequence. Thus, any specific nucleotide sequence, for example SEQ ID NO:3, **can** have either the first or the second nucleotide at the polymorphic position, not both. The same holds true for the specifically claimed amino acid sequence (SEQ ID NO:4); the amino acid sequence **can** have either the first or the second amino acid at the polymorphic position, not both. Thus, the word “can”, as used by Appellants in this context, means the possibility of the first nucleotide or amino acid or the second nucleotide or amino acid, **not** that the specific polymorphisms **identified** and **described** by Appellants are “potential” polymorphisms.

Second, the use of the term “can” in the context of the statement “the described NHP sequences can contain a variety of polymorphisms such as” those **identified** and **described** by Appellants also means that “the described NHP sequences” **can** contain other polymorphisms in addition to those **identified** and **described** by Appellants, including any previously identified polymorphisms, and any polymorphisms that might be identified in the future. Thus, the word “can”, as used by Appellants in this context, means the possibility of the claimed sequences containing other polymorphisms in addition to those **identified** and **described** by Appellants, **not** that the specific polymorphisms **identified** and **described** by Appellants are “potential” polymorphisms. Thus, the Examiner’s argument completely fails to support the alleged lack of utility, and taken with the admission that “forensic analysis can be useful for determining the presence or absence of polymorphisms which (*sic*) have been demonstrated to exist” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 7), actually suggests that the presently claimed sequences meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In view of the facts presented above, Appellants respectfully point out that the Examiner’s position

concerning the statements in the specification **completely** defies logic, and in no way meets the Examiner's burden of establishing that those skilled in the art would not believe the presently claimed sequence has the utility asserted by Appellants. In conclusion, Appellants submit that the use of the term "can" in the section of the specification quoted by the Examiner in **no way** suggests to the skilled artisan that the polymorphic markers **identified** and **described** by Appellants are merely "potential" polymorphic markers, and point out that the use of the term "can" is completely proper when considered in the above context.

Additionally, Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that a sequence sharing 100% **identity at the protein level** over an extended region of the claimed sequence is present in the leading scientific repository for biological sequence data (GenBank), and has been annotated by third party scientists at the National Center for Biotechnology Information who are *wholly unaffiliated with Appellants* as a "serine protease" (GenBank accession number XM\_171629; see **Exhibit A** in the Appeal Brief), and that an **additional** sequence sharing almost 100% percent **identity at the amino acid level** over an even greater length of the described sequence is present in the leading scientific repository for biological sequence data (GenBank), and has also been annotated by third party scientists *wholly unaffiliated with Appellants* as a "serine protease" (GenBank accession number XM\_208689; see **Exhibit B** in the Appeal Brief). The Examiner continues to question Appellants' assertion that the presently claimed sequence encodes a human serine protease, citing articles by Attwood and Miller (*Comput. Chem.* **25**:329-339, 2001) and Ponting (*Brief. Bioinform.* **2**:19-29, 2001) in an attempt to support this position.

Appellants first pointed out that the PTO has repeatedly attempted to deny the utility of nucleic acid sequences based on a small number of spurious publications that call into doubt the usefulness of bioinformatic predictions, of which these two articles are merely the latest examples. The Examiner states that "(t)he cited references of Attwood et al. and Ponting are not spurious publications because the references provide rational and scientific explanations" (the Examiner's Answer at page 8). Appellants respectfully point out that the references cited by the Examiner (as well as a handful of other references cited by the PTO in the context of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101) are in fact "spurious", in that there are **hundreds** if not **thousands** of journal articles, which also use "rational and scientific explanations", to **support** Appellants' position that the **overwhelming majority** of those of skill in the relevant art would



believe prediction of protein function from homology information and the usefulness of bioinformatic predictions to be powerful and useful tools. Appellants respectfully point out that the legal test for utility simply involves an assessment of whether those skilled in the art would find any of the utilities described for the invention to be believable. As believability is the standard for meeting the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101, and not 100% consensus or 100% accuracy, Appellants submit that, given the numerous references that support Appellants' assertion, as well as these two GenBank annotations by third party scientists, the present claims must clearly meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Appellants further pointed out that while they agree that there is not 100% consensus within the scientific community regarding prediction of protein function from homology information, and further agree that prediction of protein function from homology information is not 100% accurate, the lack of 100% consensus on prediction of protein function from homology information is completely irrelevant to the question of whether the claimed nucleic acid sequence has a substantial and specific utility, and that 100% accuracy of prediction of protein function from homology information is not the standard for patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Appellants respectfully point out Peter Duesberg, a member of the National Academy of Science, has published a number of papers in which he argues that the HIV virus is not the cause of AIDS. However, citation of these references does not serve to prove that those of skill in the art do not believe that HIV causes AIDS. Likewise, the citation of a few articles that question prediction of protein function from homology information is not indicative of what a substantial number of skilled artisans believe concerning prediction of protein function from homology information, and therefore does not support an allegation that the presently claimed sequences lack a patentable utility. Without evidence that a substantial number of those of skill in the art would not believe Appellants' assertion that the presently claimed sequence encodes a serine protease, the Examiner's argument fails to support the alleged lack of utility. Furthermore, in addition to the references cited by the Examiner not providing a general consensus that those of skill in the art do not believe prediction of protein function from homology information, the references cited by the Examiner to not speak at all to the specific sequences claimed by Appellants. Thus, while Appellants have provided evidence of record that conclusively establishes that those skilled in the art would believe that the specifically claimed sequence encodes a serine protease, the Examiner has

provided no evidence that directly establishes that the specifically claimed sequence does not encode a serine protease. Accordingly, the evidence of record compels a finding that the present invention has a patentable utility.

Furthermore, with regard to references that teach that slight variation in amino acid sequence can lead to proteins with different functions, Appellants pointed out that the PTO itself does not require 100% identity between proteins to establish functional homology. Example 10 of the Revised Interim Utility Guidelines Training Materials only requires a similarity score greater than 95% to establish functional homology. Thus, scientific publications that generally assert that very small changes between amino acid sequences can lead to changes in function, or publications describing specific examples of proteins, distinct from Appellants sequence, where a minor change in amino acid sequence has lead to a change in function, have been viewed by the PTO itself as irrelevant to the question of utility, and thus do not support the Examiner's allegation that the presently claimed sequence lacks utility. Therefore, the present utility rejection must fail as a matter of policy, as a matter of science, and as a matter of law.

Furthermore, Appellants detailed additional examples of the utility of the present nucleotide sequences, such as in assessing gene expression patterns using high-throughput DNA chips, and in determining the genomic structure of the protein encoding regions of the corresponding human chromosome. The Examiner continues to question these assertions of utility, because "any new polynucleotide" can be used in these applications (the Examiner's Answer at page 9). Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that these arguments are flawed in a number of respects. However, Appellants wish to emphasize one important point that has never been addressed by the Examiner. Appellants once again respectfully point out that the Examiner is clearly confusing the requirement for a specific utility, which is the proper standard for utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, with the requirement for a unique utility, which is clearly an improper standard. As clearly stated by the Federal Circuit in *Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC*, 20 USPQ2d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 1991; "*Carl Zeiss*"):

An invention need not be the best or only way to accomplish a certain result, and it need only be useful to some extent and in certain applications: "[T]he fact that an invention has only limited utility and is only operable in certain applications is not grounds for finding a lack of utility." *Envirotech Corp. v. Al George, Inc.*, 221 USPQ 473, 480 (Fed. Cir. 1984)

Thus, the quote above clearly establishes that the fact that other polynucleotides can be used in assessing gene expression patterns and determining the genomic structure of the protein coding regions of the corresponding human chromosome are completely irrelevant in assessing the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The only relevant enquiry with regard to patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is whether every polynucleotide can be used in assessing gene expression patterns and determining the genomic structure of the protein coding regions of the corresponding human chromosome, and the answer is an emphatic no. Importantly, the holding in *Carl Zeiss* is mandatory legal authority that is directly applicable to the present appeal, and directly rebuts the Examiner's argument. Appellants further pointed out that the requirement for a unique utility is not only in conflict with established case law, it is also not the standard adopted by the Patent and Trademark Office. If every invention were required to have a unique utility, the Patent and Trademark Office would no longer be issuing patents on batteries, automobile tires, golf balls, golf clubs, and treatments for a variety of human diseases, such as cancer and bacterial or viral infections, just to name a few particular examples, because examples of each of these have already been described and patented. All batteries have the exact same utility - specifically, to provide power. All automobile tires have the exact same utility - specifically, for use on automobiles. All golf balls and golf clubs have the exact same utility - specifically, use in the game of golf. All cancer treatments have the exact same utility - specifically, to treat cancer. All anti-infectious agents have the exact same broader utility - specifically, to treat infections. However, only the briefest perusal of virtually any issue of the Official Gazette provides numerous examples of patents being granted on each of the above compositions every week. Furthermore, if a composition needed to be unique to be patented, the entire class and subclass system would be an effort in futility, as the class and subclass system serves solely to group such common inventions, which would not be required if each invention needed to have a unique utility. Thus, the present claims clearly meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

For each of the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth in the Appeal Brief, Appellants submit that the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 must be overruled.

**B. Are Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 Unusable Due to a Lack of Patentable Utility?**

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, since allegedly one skilled in the art would not know how to use the invention, as the invention allegedly is not supported by either a clear asserted utility or a well-established utility, Appellants submit that as claims 1, 2 and 5-10 have been shown to have “a specific, substantial, and credible utility”, as detailed in Section X(A) above, as well as Section VIII(A) of the Appeal Brief, the present rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, cannot stand.

Appellants therefore submit that the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, must be overruled.

**C. Do Claims 1 and 7-10 Lack Sufficient Written Description?**

Appellants do not wish to restate all of the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief concerning the Examiner’s allegation that claims 1 and 7-10 contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, and instead incorporate the entirety of Section VIII(C) of the Appeal Brief at this point herein by reference. However, Appellants are compelled to specifically address certain arguments presented in the Examiner’s Answer for the record.

The Examiner continues to insist that the present claims lack sufficient written description support because the claims “encompass a wide breadth of polynucleotides with biological functions that have yet to be discovered” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 11). Appellants once again respectfully point out that there is **no requirement whatsoever** that novel fragments of a novel sequence have the **exact same function** as the full length sequence in order to be patented. If this were to be the case, hundreds, if not thousands, of issued U.S. Patents would be instantly invalidated, as they each claim nucleotide fragments that have not been demonstrated to have the exact same function as the full length nucleotide sequence. Appellants therefore submit that the claimed sequence meets the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Additionally, the Examiner states that claims 1 and 7-10 do not meet the written description

requirements because “the instant application only discloses only (*sic*) one species encompassed by the claim: a polynucleotide consisting of a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:3” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 11). Appellants respectfully disagree, and simply point out that SEQ ID NO:3, which the Examiner admits is disclosed in the instant application, alone discloses well over 1000 species (over 900 60-mers alone) that are encompassed by claim 1 (“[A]n isolated nucleic acid molecule comprising at least 60 contiguous nucleotides from SEQ ID NO:3”). Thus, the Examiner’s argument fails to support the allegation that claims 1, 7 and 10 lack sufficient written description support.

Finally, the Examiner has not commented at all on any of the case law cited by Appellants that supports Appellants assertion that the present claims meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Appellants wish to emphasize the holding of one case in particular for the record. Recently, the standard for complying with the written description requirement in claims involving chemical materials has been explicitly set forth by the Federal Circuit:

In claims involving chemical materials, generic formulae usually indicate with specificity what the generic claims encompass. One skilled in the art can distinguish such a formula from others and can identify many of the species that the claims encompass. Accordingly, such a formula is normally an adequate description of the claimed genus. *Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Thus, a claim describing a genus of nucleic acids by structure, formula, chemical name or physical properties sufficient to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to distinguish the genus from other materials meets the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As further elaborated by the Federal Circuit in *Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*:

In claims to genetic material ... a generic statement such as ‘vertebrate insulin cDNA’ or ‘mammalian insulin cDNA’, without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the claimed genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of members of the genus. (Emphasis added)

Thus, as the nucleic acid sequences of the present invention are not distinguished on the basis of function, or a method of isolation, but in fact are distinguished by structural features - a chemical formula, *i.e.*, the

*sequence itself*, the present claims meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Using the nucleic acid sequences of the present invention (as set forth in the Sequence Listing), the skilled artisan would readily be able to **distinguish** the claimed nucleic acids from other materials on the basis of the specific **structural** description provided. Polynucleotides comprising at least 60 contiguous bases from SEQ ID NO:3 are within the genus of the instant claims, while those that lack this **structural** feature lie outside the genus. The claimed genus of polynucleotides is clearly defined in structural terms, which is **all that is required** of claims 1 and 7-10 to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph (*Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, *supra*).

Nevertheless, while in no way agreeing with the present rejection, should this rejection be maintained through all levels of appeal available to Appellants, and should this issue be the sole impediment to patentability of the present claims, Appellants hereby state that a deposit of the original clone containing SEQ ID NO:3 would be made to the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC), thus removing all question of whether the claims meet the written description requirement. It is well established through years of court decisions, and recently confirmed by the Federal Circuit in *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.* (296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002)), a deposit of biological material with the ATCC can be used to satisfy the written description requirement.

For each of the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claims 1 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, must be overruled.

## XI. CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully submit that, in light of the foregoing arguments, as well as the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief, the conclusion that claims 1, 2 and 5-10 lack a patentable utility and are unusable by the skilled artisan due to a lack of patentable utility, and that claims 1 and 7-10 are not enabled and lack sufficient written description, is unwarranted. It is therefore requested that the Board overturn the Final Action's rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

February 4, 2004

Date



David W. Hibler  
Agent For Appellants

Reg. No. 41,071

LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED  
8800 Technology Forest Place  
The Woodlands, TX 77381  
(281) 863-3399

**Customer # 24231**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC</i> , 20 USPQ2d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (citing <i>Envirotech Corp. v. Al George, Inc.</i> , 221 USPQ 473, 480 (Fed. Cir. 1984)) . . . . .	7, 8
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002) . . .	11
<i>Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) . . . . .	10, 11



## **STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 2, 5-8

35 U.S.C. § 112 ..... 2, 8-11



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Walke *et al.*

Serial No.: 09/755,016

Group Art Unit: 1652

Filed: 01/05/2001

Examiner: C. Fronda

For: Novel Human Proteases and Polynucleotides Attorney Docket No.: LEX-0114-USA  
Encoding the Same

**REPLY BRIEF**

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	1
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	1
III.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS .....	1
IV.	STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS .....	1
V.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION .....	2
VI.	ISSUES ON APPEAL .....	2
VII.	GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS .....	2
VIII.	CLAIMS APPEALED .....	2
IX.	PRIOR ART OF RECORD .....	2
X.	ARGUMENT .....	3-11
	A. Do Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 Lack a Patentable Utility? .....	3-8
	B. Are Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 Unusable Due to a Lack of Patentable Utility? .....	9
	C. Do Claims 1 and 7-10 Meet The Written Description Requirement? .....	9-11
XI.	CONCLUSION .....	12

## **APPEAL BRIEF**

Sir:

Appellants hereby submit an original and two copies of this Reply Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("the Board") in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on December 4, 2003. This Reply Brief is timely submitted, and Appellants believe no fees are due in connection with this Reply Brief. However, should any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 be required for any reason related to this communication, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Lexicon Genetics Incorporated Deposit Account No. 50-0892.

### **I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(a) statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief" (Examiner's Answer at page 1).

### **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

### **III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

### **IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he summary of invention contained in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **VI. ISSUES ON APPEAL**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **VII. GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS**

Appellants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that "Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 2, and 5-10 do not stand or fall together" (Examiner's Answer at page 2). Appellants clearly stated in the Appeal Brief, and reiterate here, that "(f)or the purposes of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, associated with the utility rejection, the claims will stand or fall together. For the purposes of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, associated with written description, claims 1 and 7-10 will stand or fall together."

## **VIII. CLAIMS APPEALED**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "(t)he copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct" (Examiner's Answer at page 2).

## **IX. PRIOR ART OF RECORD**

Appellants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "Attwood et al." and "Ponting" are the only prior art references of record relied on in the currently pending rejections (Examiner's Answer bridging pages 2 and 3).

## X. ARGUMENT

### A. Do Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 Lack a Patentable Utility?

Appellants do not wish to restate all of the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief concerning the Examiner's allegation that claims 1, 2 and 5-10 lack a patentable utility, and instead incorporate the entirety of Section VIII(A) of the Appeal Brief at this point herein by reference. However, Appellants are compelled to specifically address certain arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer for the record.

Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that the present nucleic acid sequences have utility in forensic analysis, as described in the specification as originally filed (see, for example, page 10, lines 13-24). As described in the specification at page 15, lines 22-29, the presently claimed sequence defines three coding single nucleotide polymorphisms - specifically, a C/T polymorphism at nucleotide position 28 of SEQ ID NO:3, a silent polymorphism that results in a leucine at amino acid position 10 of SEQ ID NO:4; a C/T polymorphism at nucleotide position 55 of SEQ ID NO:3, which can result in a tyrosine or histidine at amino acid position 19 of SEQ ID NO:4; and a G/A polymorphism at nucleotide position 379 of SEQ ID NO:3, which can result in an alanine or threonine at amino acid position 127 of SEQ ID NO:4. Appellants pointed out that as such polymorphisms are the basis for forensic analysis, which is undoubtedly a "real world" utility, the presently claimed sequence must in itself be useful.

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states that "forensic analysis can be useful for determining the presence or absence of polymorphisms which (*sic*) have been demonstrated to exist" (the Examiner's Answer at page 7), but then states that the polymorphic markers **identified** and **described** by Appellants in the specification as originally filed are not useful in forensic analysis because "the instant specification only describes **potential** polymorphisms but not actual polymorphisms" (the Examiner's Answer at page 7, emphasis in original). The Examiner appears to believe that the polymorphic markers **identified** and **described** by Appellants in the specification as originally filed are not "actual" polymorphisms because of the use of the word "can" by Appellants: "the specification states on page 15, lines 22-30: 'the described NHP sequences **can** contain a variety of polymorphisms such as at nucleotide 28 of SEQ ID NO:3 and nucleotide 55 of SEQ ID NO:3 which both can be a C or a T and **can** give rise to silent mutation at corresponding amino acid position 10 of SEQ ID NO:4 or a tyr or his at amino acid position 19 of SEQ

ID NO:4. The described NHP sequences can also contain G-A polymorphisms at nucleotide 379 of SEQ ID NO:3 and nucleotide position 199 of SEQ ID NO:5 which **can** give rise to a corresponding ala or thr at amino acid position 127 of SEQ ID NO:4, or residue 67 of SEQ ID NO:6.’ (emphasis added)” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 6, emphasis in original).

First, it should be pointed out that the section of the specification quoted by the Examiner refers to “sequences”, specifically, the claimed SEQ ID NOS:3 and 4. Appellants respectfully point out that nucleotide and amino acid sequences in and of themselves cannot contain a polymorphism - rather, a polymorphism is a representation of a position in a population of nucleotide sequences that exhibits variability within a number of independent isolates of a given sequence. Thus, any specific nucleotide sequence, for example SEQ ID NO:3, can have either the first or the second nucleotide at the polymorphic position, not both. The same holds true for the specifically claimed amino acid sequence (SEQ ID NO:4); the amino acid sequence can have either the first or the second amino acid at the polymorphic position, not both. Thus, the word “can”, as used by Appellants in this context, means the possibility of the first nucleotide or amino acid or the second nucleotide or amino acid, not that the specific polymorphisms identified and described by Appellants are “potential” polymorphisms.

Second, the use of the term “can” in the context of the statement “the described NHP sequences can contain a variety of polymorphisms such as” those identified and described by Appellants also means that “the described NHP sequences” can contain other polymorphisms in addition to those identified and described by Appellants, including any previously identified polymorphisms, and any polymorphisms that might be identified in the future. Thus, the word “can”, as used by Appellants in this context, means the possibility of the claimed sequences containing other polymorphisms in addition to those identified and described by Appellants, not that the specific polymorphisms identified and described by Appellants are “potential” polymorphisms. Thus, the Examiner’s argument completely fails to support the alleged lack of utility, and taken with the admission that “forensic analysis can be useful for determining the presence or absence of polymorphisms which (*sic*) have been demonstrated to exist” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 7), actually suggests that the presently claimed sequences meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In view of the facts presented above, Appellants respectfully point out that the Examiner’s position

concerning the statements in the specification completely defies logic, and in no way meets the Examiner's burden of establishing that those skilled in the art would not believe the presently claimed sequence has the utility asserted by Appellants. In conclusion, Appellants submit that the use of the term "can" in the section of the specification quoted by the Examiner in no way suggests to the skilled artisan that the polymorphic markers identified and described by Appellants are merely "potential" polymorphic markers, and point out that the use of the term "can" is completely proper when considered in the above context.

Additionally, Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that a sequence sharing 100% identity at the protein level over an extended region of the claimed sequence is present in the leading scientific repository for biological sequence data (GenBank), and has been annotated by third party scientists at the National Center for Biotechnology Information who are *wholly unaffiliated with Appellants* as a "serine protease" (GenBank accession number XM\_171629; see **Exhibit A** in the Appeal Brief), and that an additional sequence sharing almost 100% percent identity at the amino acid level over an even greater length of the described sequence is present in the leading scientific repository for biological sequence data (GenBank), and has also been annotated by third party scientists *wholly unaffiliated with Appellants* as a "serine protease" (GenBank accession number XM\_208689; see **Exhibit B** in the Appeal Brief). The Examiner continues to question Appellants' assertion that the presently claimed sequence encodes a human serine protease, citing articles by Attwood and Miller (*Comput. Chem.* **25**:329-339, 2001) and Ponting (*Brief. Bioinform.* **2**:19-29, 2001) in an attempt to support this position.

Appellants first pointed out that the PTO has repeatedly attempted to deny the utility of nucleic acid sequences based on a small number of spurious publications that call into doubt the usefulness of bioinformatic predictions, of which these two articles are merely the latest examples. The Examiner states that "(t)he cited references of Attwood et al. and Ponting are not spurious publications because the references provide rational and scientific explanations" (the Examiner's Answer at page 8). Appellants respectfully point out that the references cited by the Examiner (as well as a handful of other references cited by the PTO in the context of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101) are in fact "spurious", in that there are hundreds if not thousands of journal articles, which also use "rational and scientific explanations", to **support** Appellants' position that the overwhelming majority of those of skill in the relevant art would



believe prediction of protein function from homology information and the usefulness of bioinformatic predictions to be powerful and useful tools. Appellants respectfully point out that the legal test for utility simply involves an assessment of whether those skilled in the art would find any of the utilities described for the invention to be believable. As believability is the standard for meeting the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101, and not 100% consensus or 100% accuracy, Appellants submit that, given the numerous references that support Appellants' assertion, as well as these two GenBank annotations by third party scientists, the present claims must clearly meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Appellants further pointed out that while they agree that there is not 100% consensus within the scientific community regarding prediction of protein function from homology information, and further agree that prediction of protein function from homology information is not 100% accurate, the lack of 100% consensus on prediction of protein function from homology information is completely irrelevant to the question of whether the claimed nucleic acid sequence has a substantial and specific utility, and that 100% accuracy of prediction of protein function from homology information is not the standard for patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Appellants respectfully point out Peter Duesberg, a member of the National Academy of Science, has published a number of papers in which he argues that the HIV virus is not the cause of AIDS. However, citation of these references does not serve to prove that those of skill in the art do not believe that HIV causes AIDS. Likewise, the citation of a few articles that question prediction of protein function from homology information is not indicative of what a substantial number of skilled artisans believe concerning prediction of protein function from homology information, and therefore does not support an allegation that the presently claimed sequences lack a patentable utility. Without evidence that a substantial number of those of skill in the art would not believe Appellants' assertion that the presently claimed sequence encodes a serine protease, the Examiner's argument fails to support the alleged lack of utility. Furthermore, in addition to the references cited by the Examiner not providing a general consensus that those of skill in the art do not believe prediction of protein function from homology information, the references cited by the Examiner to not speak at all to the specific sequences claimed by Appellants. Thus, while Appellants have provided evidence of record that conclusively establishes that those skilled in the art would believe that the specifically claimed sequence encodes a serine protease, the Examiner has

provided no evidence that directly establishes that the specifically claimed sequence does not encode a serine protease. Accordingly, the evidence of record compels a finding that the present invention has a patentable utility.

Furthermore, with regard to references that teach that slight variation in amino acid sequence can lead to proteins with different functions, Appellants pointed out that the PTO itself does not require 100% identity between proteins to establish functional homology. Example 10 of the Revised Interim Utility Guidelines Training Materials only requires a similarity score greater than 95% to establish functional homology. Thus, scientific publications that generally assert that very small changes between amino acid sequences can lead to changes in function, or publications describing specific examples of proteins, distinct from Appellants sequence, where a minor change in amino acid sequence has lead to a change in function, have been viewed by the PTO itself as irrelevant to the question of utility, and thus do not support the Examiner's allegation that the presently claimed sequence lacks utility. Therefore, the present utility rejection must fail as a matter of policy, as a matter of science, and as a matter of law.

Furthermore, Appellants detailed additional examples of the utility of the present nucleotide sequences, such as in assessing gene expression patterns using high-throughput DNA chips, and in determining the genomic structure of the protein encoding regions of the corresponding human chromosome. The Examiner continues to question these assertions of utility, because "any new polynucleotide" can be used in these applications (the Examiner's Answer at page 9). Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that these arguments are flawed in a number of respects. However, Appellants wish to emphasize one important point that has never been addressed by the Examiner. Appellants once again respectfully point out that the Examiner is clearly confusing the requirement for a specific utility, which is the proper standard for utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, with the requirement for a unique utility, which is clearly an improper standard. As clearly stated by the Federal Circuit in *Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC*, 20 USPQ2d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 1991; "*Carl Zeiss*");

An invention need not be the best or only way to accomplish a certain result, and it need only be useful to some extent and in certain applications: "[T]he fact that an invention has only limited utility and is only operable in certain applications is not grounds for finding a lack of utility." *Envirotech Corp. v. Al George, Inc.*, 221 USPQ 473, 480 (Fed. Cir. 1984)

Thus, the quote above clearly establishes that the fact that other polynucleotides can be used in assessing gene expression patterns and determining the genomic structure of the protein coding regions of the corresponding human chromosome are completely irrelevant in assessing the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The only relevant enquiry with regard to patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is whether every polynucleotide can be used in assessing gene expression patterns and determining the genomic structure of the protein coding regions of the corresponding human chromosome, and the answer is an emphatic no. Importantly, the holding in *Carl Zeiss* is mandatory legal authority that is directly applicable to the present appeal, and directly rebuts the Examiner's argument. Appellants further pointed out that the requirement for a unique utility is not only in conflict with established case law, it is also not the standard adopted by the Patent and Trademark Office. If every invention were required to have a unique utility, the Patent and Trademark Office would no longer be issuing patents on batteries, automobile tires, golf balls, golf clubs, and treatments for a variety of human diseases, such as cancer and bacterial or viral infections, just to name a few particular examples, because examples of each of these have already been described and patented. All batteries have the exact same utility - specifically, to provide power. All automobile tires have the exact same utility - specifically, for use on automobiles. All golf balls and golf clubs have the exact same utility - specifically, use in the game of golf. All cancer treatments have the exact same utility - specifically, to treat cancer. All anti-infectious agents have the exact same broader utility - specifically, to treat infections. However, only the briefest perusal of virtually any issue of the Official Gazette provides numerous examples of patents being granted on each of the above compositions every week. Furthermore, if a composition needed to be unique to be patented, the entire class and subclass system would be an effort in futility, as the class and subclass system serves solely to group such common inventions, which would not be required if each invention needed to have a unique utility. Thus, the present claims clearly meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

For each of the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth in the Appeal Brief, Appellants submit that the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 must be overruled.

**B. Are Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 Unusable Due to a Lack of Patentable Utility?**

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, since allegedly one skilled in the art would not know how to use the invention, as the invention allegedly is not supported by either a clear asserted utility or a well-established utility, Appellants submit that as claims 1, 2 and 5-10 have been shown to have “a specific, substantial, and credible utility”, as detailed in Section X(A) above, as well as Section VIII(A) of the Appeal Brief, the present rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, cannot stand.

Appellants therefore submit that the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, must be overruled.

**C. Do Claims 1 and 7-10 Lack Sufficient Written Description?**

Appellants do not wish to restate all of the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief concerning the Examiner’s allegation that claims 1 and 7-10 contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, and instead incorporate the entirety of Section VIII(C) of the Appeal Brief at this point herein by reference. However, Appellants are compelled to specifically address certain arguments presented in the Examiner’s Answer for the record.

The Examiner continues to insist that the present claims lack sufficient written description support because the claims “encompass a wide breadth of polynucleotides with biological functions that have yet to be discovered” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 11). Appellants once again respectfully point out that there is **no requirement whatsoever** that novel fragments of a novel sequence have the **exact same function** as the full length sequence in order to be patented. If this were to be the case, **hundreds**, if not **thousands**, of issued U.S. Patents would be **instantly** invalidated, as they each claim nucleotide fragments that have not been demonstrated to have the exact same function as the full length nucleotide sequence. Appellants therefore submit that the claimed sequence meets the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Additionally, the Examiner states that claims 1 and 7-10 do not meet the written description

requirements because “the instant application only discloses only (*sic*) one species encompassed by the claim: a polynucleotide consisting of a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:3” (the Examiner’s Answer at page 11). Appellants respectfully disagree, and simply point out that SEQ ID NO:3, which the Examiner admits is disclosed in the instant application, alone discloses well over 1000 species (over 900 60-mers alone) that are encompassed by claim 1 (“[A]n isolated nucleic acid molecule comprising at least 60 contiguous nucleotides from SEQ ID NO:3”). Thus, the Examiner’s argument fails to support the allegation that claims 1, 7 and 10 lack sufficient written description support.

Finally, the Examiner has not commented at all on any of the case law cited by Appellants that supports Appellants assertion that the present claims meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Appellants wish to emphasize the holding of one case in particular for the record. Recently, the standard for complying with the written description requirement in claims involving chemical materials has been explicitly set forth by the Federal Circuit:

In claims involving chemical materials, generic formulae usually indicate with specificity what the generic claims encompass. One skilled in the art can distinguish such a formula from others and can identify many of the species that the claims encompass. Accordingly, such a formula is normally an adequate description of the claimed genus. *Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Thus, a claim describing a genus of nucleic acids by structure, formula, chemical name or physical properties sufficient to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to distinguish the genus from other materials meets the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As further elaborated by the Federal Circuit in *Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*:

In claims to genetic material ... a generic statement such as ‘vertebrate insulin cDNA’ or ‘mammalian insulin cDNA’, without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the claimed genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of members of the genus. (Emphasis added)

Thus, as the nucleic acid sequences of the present invention are not distinguished on the basis of function, or a method of isolation, but in fact are distinguished by structural features - a chemical formula, *i.e.*, the

*sequence itself*, the present claims meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Using the nucleic acid sequences of the present invention (as set forth in the Sequence Listing), the skilled artisan would readily be able to distinguish the claimed nucleic acids from other materials on the basis of the specific structural description provided. Polynucleotides comprising at least 60 contiguous bases from SEQ ID NO:3 are within the genus of the instant claims, while those that lack this structural feature lie outside the genus. The claimed genus of polynucleotides is clearly defined in structural terms, which is all that is required of claims 1 and 7-10 to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph (*Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, *supra*).

Nevertheless, while in no way agreeing with the present rejection, should this rejection be maintained through all levels of appeal available to Appellants, and should this issue be the sole impediment to patentability of the present claims, Appellants hereby state that a deposit of the original clone containing SEQ ID NO:3 would be made to the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC), thus removing all question of whether the claims meet the written description requirement. It is well established through years of court decisions, and recently confirmed by the Federal Circuit in *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.* (296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002)), a deposit of biological material with the ATCC can be used to satisfy the written description requirement.

For each of the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claims 1 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, must be overruled.

## XI. CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully submit that, in light of the foregoing arguments, as well as the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief, the conclusion that claims 1, 2 and 5-10 lack a patentable utility and are unusable by the skilled artisan due to a lack of patentable utility, and that claims 1 and 7-10 are not enabled and lack sufficient written description, is unwarranted. It is therefore requested that the Board overturn the Final Action's rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

February 4, 2004

Date

David W. Hibler

David W. Hibler  
Agent For Appellants

Reg. No. 41,071

LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED  
8800 Technology Forest Place  
The Woodlands, TX 77381  
(281) 863-3399

**Customer # 24231**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC</i> , 20 USPQ2d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (citing <i>Envirotech Corp. v. Al George, Inc.</i> , 221 USPQ 473, 480 (Fed. Cir. 1984)) .....	7, 8
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002) ...	11
<i>Regents of Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	10, 11



## STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	2, 5-8
35 U.S.C. § 112 .....	2, 8-11